

did state that the county did put in new signals throughout the city. The new LED signals are bigger and brighter. These new signals have been put in there at Brewster and Walton.

Chairman Colling stated that the maps format is very good and that the only recommendation he is making is using more colors. He would like to see the maps continued as it makes understanding easier. Mr. Zendel stated that he also would like to see which direction the stop sign is coming from. He also felt the map was very helpful but he couldn't figure out, on the two-ways, where the stop was. Marc Matich stated that the maps are drawn off of the city's GIS system, so they are the actual relationship. Chairman Colling stated that if anyone needed any clarification, to feel free to ask during the meeting.

Paul Shumejko stated that one segment of Dequindre seems to come up quite a bit, from Auburn Road south. The county had been planning on doing widening work there for quite some time. Paul sent the e-mail over to the Road Commission to find out when this will be done. They indicated that this is being pushed out to the year 2014. The only thing the county is budgeting for, within the next two to three years, is resurfacing. With the resurfacing, they can probably put a crown in the road. It was originally intended to be widened to five lanes, but with the cost of right-of-way acquisition, it just cost too much. Chairman Colling stated that they also have an issue with passing on the right, both north and south bound. As long as they come up with a means of dealing with that, especially in front of the dealerships there, that would help. Unfortunately, in the evening it stacks up just to the south of the Cider Mill, where someone coming out to the stop sign, from the subdivision, and someone else is passing on the shoulder and they are actually rolling over their right-of-way, between them and the sign. They are literally cutting across the entrance to streets, driveways, you name it. Marc Matich stated that the city can look into using Tri-Party monies with the city and the county. These things can be generated by the board and move forward to city council by recommendation. Finding the funding is always the problem. Paul Shumejko stated that the city's local road funding is exhausted completely, and the city is working to put together a road millage for the November ballot. A lot of these projects will be contingent on how the road millage vote turns out. They were also looking into doing a 50/50 cost, that way the residents have a vested interest.

2004-0226

Traffic Control Order No. PK-78: No Parking along Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle to east of Sandhurst

**Attachments:** Agenda Summary.pdf; Traffic Control Order 78.pdf; Map.pdf; ATSB Minutes 030904.pdf

Mr. Joel Mueller talked on behalf of the medical business at 645 Barclay Circle. They have spent thousands of dollars on trying to find an alternate to parking on the street, without any success. They are out of options on alternate places to park. The employees at 645 Barclay Circle have stopped parking at the Hampton Golf Course as they felt a threat to their safety. They certainly do not want to put anyone in the association at risk. The only thing they ask is that the decision made is consistent with policies throughout the City, and that this 1200 or 1250 feet is not an arbitrary distance that has been designed to basically inhibit them from making it feasible to have people park on the street. As long as that is the case and it is consistent with the rest of the City, they don't know of anything they can do about it. They have to, within their own means, try and solve this parking problem. The agreement they had previously was with the Golf Course and maybe they will have to see about this agreement with them again.

Pat Somerville, Mayor for the City of Rochester Hills, stated that she drives this way every morning and every night. She stated that the business has to have somewhere for their employees to park and she has yet to see that the way that they park has been a problem. They are parked solid on the one side of the street. She doesn't see how we can take away the parking from a business and make them pay for parking or force

*them into the subdivisions to park. She has failed to see anyone parked improperly and she doesn't think we should do this to any business and that these employees should have the right to park within safe walking distance of their business.*

*Board discussed that the reason for this change is the proposed resurfacing and re-striping of Hampton Circle and the creation of continuous turn lanes and the width of the roadway. The reason the "No Parking" was initially proposed was because of new striping and the alignment of the new courthouse driveway with Barclay Circle and across from Hampton Circle to the south.*

*Marc Matich stated that the parking restrictions made now to extend was mainly due because of restricted sight distance for the driveway of Ashley Circle and also Sandhurst and the traffic control order does extend back that far in case we do have a problem as far back as Sandhurst.*

*Chairman Colling stated that the one reason the proposed "No Parking" is being extended to the south side is because the road doesn't widen up any further until past Sandhurst at this point. The current additional restriction leaves a 120 foot section for parking and protecting the sight distance on Ashley Court coming out to Hampton Circle. Marc Matich stated that for this kind of roadway and this type of speed the minimum sight distance for this intersection would be 410 feet. The complaint the City had from the Barclay Condominium Association was that the parking was encroaching into the intersection radius' and limiting the sight distances to less than the 410 feet. They are down around the 200 feet range for sight distance there currently and this is less and substandard to what the City usually requires for a typical sight distance in an intersection. Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer for the City, reminded everyone of the continuous left turn or center lane that will be constructed this summer on Hampton Circle. This paving project will mean that an additional two feet of roadway widening will occur and will prohibit parking on the street. Chairman Colling stated that he could understand no parking restrictions from Barclay Circle at least to past Ashley Court. On the south side of the roadway, he can see the restrictions all the way to Sandhurst because this is a natural break point. There have been no complaints on Club Drive, just Ashley. Chairman Colling stated that the problem is from Barclay to Sandhurst and we already know about the problem from Barclay to Ashley from the last meeting. The roadway will not be wide enough once the center lane is constructed all the way through Hampton Circle this August. Chairman Colling stated he wanted to modify the parking order so that it includes from Barclay to Sandhurst and have the sight distance maintained at Ashley Court (so leave the 120 foot section there), and suggest they allow parking from the corner of Ashley Court to just before Club Drive maintaining sight distances. Chairman Colling told Mr. Mueller that they basically have until August to come up with a permanent solution to this parking problem.*

*Mr. Hunter asked that new traffic counts be done on Hampton Circle now that the new courthouse is there and operational. Would like the counts done from now until August of 2004. Chairman Colling also wants to bring this issue back before the board before August to see where they are at.*

**A motion was made by Citizen Representative Brown, seconded by Citizen Representative Buiteweg, that this matter be Referred to the City Council. No Parking along the south side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle to just east of Sandhurst, as amended, allowing parking from Ashley Court to Club Drive outside of the safe sight distance area.**

**Whereas, Traffic Control Order No. PK-78 has been issued by the City Transportation Engineer under the provisions of Chapter 98 of the Rochester Hills Code of Ordinances, Michigan Vehicle Code, MCL 257.1 et seq.; and**

**Whereas, said Traffic Control Order covers:**

**TCO No. PK-78.1 No Parking within the right-of-way of south side of Hampton**

Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Nine Hundred Fifty (950) feet easterly thereof.

TCO No. PK-78.2 No Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Two Hundred Sixty (260) feet easterly thereof.

TCO No. PK-78.3 No Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle (at their south intersection) from a point Three Hundred Eighty (380) feet to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order shall not be effective after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the date of issuance, except upon approval by this Council; and

Whereas, the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board has considered the issues pertaining to the Traffic Control Order and recommends that the Order be approved;

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council approves the issuance of Traffic Control Order No. PK-78 to be in effect until rescinded or superseded by subsequent order; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a certified copy of this Resolution be filed together with the Traffic Control Order, with the City Clerk of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan and signs and/or markings in conformity with the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices giving notice of the same have been placed and maintained.

This Order rescinds and supercedes the following Traffic Control Order(s) adopted by the City of Rochester Hills: PK-76.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** Brown, Buiteweg, Colling, Jr., Hunter, Moore and Zendel

**Absent:** Oza

**2004-0227**

Traffic Control Order SS-131: Streets within Chichester Subdivision No. 4, Section 5

**Attachments:** Agenda Summary.pdf; Traffic Control Order SS131.pdf; Sec5TrafficSigns.pdf

*Marc Matich told everyone that the video being viewed was of the intersection of Grandview and Ridgefield Court. Mr. Matich went over the facts sheet that was included with the agenda packet on this issue. The facts sheet was prepared by the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) of Oakland County, a non-profit organization. He stated that the decisions should be carefully made on whether to install a stop sign or not because of the long range impacts. Answers to the following questions should be considered: Does it meet established warrants? What is the likelihood of noncompliance? What is the potential for increase in traffic crashes and liability? What will be the impact on traffic flow? Who would be opposed to this type of change? The two most important questions according to the TIA are; Will this help maximize both the safety and efficiency of pedestrians and vehicular traffic? And will it help and ensure that all citizens will maintain a healthy respect for the community's total traffic control system?*

*Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer for the City, reviewed the background on this*